

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,646	9/923,646 08/07/2001		Syed Ashfaq Mahmood	705443US2	1156
24938	7590	09/29/2005		EXAMINER	
		LER INTELLECT	JEANTY, ROMAIN		
CIMS 483-02-19 800 CHRYSLER DR EAST			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
AUBURN HILLS, MI 48326-2757				3623	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/923,646	MAHMOOD ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Romain Jeanty	3623				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA: Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was provided to the same period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 Au	<u> </u>	•				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
·	— • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	vn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •					
 Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau 	•	ed in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , ,	d.				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal P	atent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)					

Application/Control Number: 09/923,646 Page 2

Art Unit: 3623

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melchione et al "Melchione" (US Patent No. 5,966,695) in view of Burdick et al "Burdick" (US Patent No. 5,625,816)

As per claim 1, Melchione discloses method for identifying sales targets using a central database to improve marketing success. In so doing, Melchione discloses

creating the centralized database for maintaining the marketing data (col. 2, lines 39-51), compiling marketing data from the plurality of disparate data sources into the centralized database wherein the marketing data is compiled into the centralized database on a periodic basis (col. 6, lines 43-58; col. 10, lines 47-59). Melchione does not expressly disclose creating a venue specific database as a subset of data contained within the centralized database wherein the venue specific database is in a format specific to the venue, and providing access to the venue specific database through an interface module. Burdick in the same field of endeavor, discloses the concept of a local database (venue database) and accessing the local database (col. 6, lines 36-47). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Melchione to incorporate the teachings of Burdick in order to store and retrieving data locally.

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 2, Melchione does not expressly disclose validating the marketing data before it is compiled into the centralized database. However, validation data is notoriously old and well known in the art for protecting the integrity of the data. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to validate the marketing data of Melchione in order to prevent the validity of the data.

As per claim 3, Melchione further discloses wherein the plurality of disparate data sources comprise internal data sources, external data sources and legacy systems (col. 9, lines 47-59).

As per claim 4, Melchione and Burdick are silent with regard to the venue specific data comprises a markup language. However, it is old and well known in the art to utilize html. At the time of the invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use HTML to in order to language because of the user friendliness of ease of use of the language format data in markup language for easy retrieval of the data.

As per claim 5, Melchione is silent with regard wherein the interface module is an application programming interface. However, utilizing an application programming interface is old and well known in the art for easy access to information. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate an application programming interface into the disclosures of Melchione and Burbick for enabling easy transport of the information.

As per claim 6, Melchione discloses a system and method for identifying sales target. In so doing, Melchione discloses collecting the marketing data for the product/service from a plurality of sources, aggregating the marketing data into a centralized database (col. 6, lines 43-58; col. 10, lines 47-59), extracting a subset of the marketing data from the centralized database

Art Unit: 3623

(i.e., retrieving data from the central database) (col. 21, lines 9-15). Melchione does not expressly disclose creating a venue specific database as a subset of data contained within the centralized database wherein the venue specific database is in a format specific to the venue, and providing access to the venue specific database through an interface module. Burdick in the same field of endeavor, discloses the concept of a local database (venue database) and accessing the local database (col. 6, lines 36-47). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Melchione to incorporate the teachings of Burdick in order to store and retrieving data locally.

As per claim 7, claim 7 recites the same limitations of claim 6 above; therefore is rejected under the same analysis relied upon of claim 6.

As per claim 8, claim 8 recite the same limitations of rejected claim 2 above; therefore is rejected under the same analysis relied upon of claim 2.

Conclusion

- 3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- a. Jones et al (US Patent No. 6,925,441) discloses a method for gathering marketing data for conducting analysis.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (571) 272-6732. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30 am - 6:00 pm.

Application/Control Number: 09/923,646

Art Unit: 3623

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R. Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Romain Jeanty Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3623

9/19/2005